APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/474,643	12/29/1999	CHERYL CAMP HAYNES	19260-1800/B	2514

7590   10/08/2003

MARCUS DELGADO
BELLSOUTH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT CORP.
1155 PEACHTREE STREET
SUITE 500
ATLANTA, GA   30309

EXAMINER
VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/474,643	Applicant(s) HAYNES ET AL.
	Examiner Beth Van Doren	Art Unit 3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 August 2003</u> .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a)☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a Final office action in response to communications received 08/05/03.

Claims 1, 11-12, 14, 17, 19-20, 23, and 30-31 have been amended. Claims 1-31 are now pending

in this application.

Response to Amendment

2.   Examiner withdraws the 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth in the

previous office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA

35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-11, and 13-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Storch et al. (U.S. 5,920,846).

4.   As per claim 1, Storch et al. discloses a method for eliminating an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician, comprising:

generating a service order indicating that a dispatch of a service technician is required (See column 53, lines 60-67, column 54, lines 1-15 and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-10 and 18-30, wherein a service order is generated in the system and a date is set up in the system based on the availability of technicians);

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch (See at least figure 12, column 53, lines 29-46, column 54, lines 1-4 and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-5, column 56, lines 1-19, 25-37, and 41-56, column 57, lines 8-31, wherein the predefined criteria are obtained and used to generate the initial service order. After an appointment is set on the initial service order, the predefined criteria are looked at to determine if the service order does not require a dispatch);

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary (See at least figure 12, and column 57, lines 8-31, wherein when the service order meets certain criteria, based on previously obtained data the dispatch is determined to be not needed); and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then canceling the dispatch associated with the service order (See at least figure 12, column 57, lines 8-31 and 34-40, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, and 53-56, wherein the dispatch is not needed and the dispatch associated with the service order is eliminated).

5.   As per claim 2, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

determining whether the service order was initiated by a competitive local exchange

carrier (See column 53, lines 30-48, and column 54, lines 10-13 and 42-60, in which discusses a

remote location selling telecommunications services interfacing with a central computer that

maintains overall records concerning appointment dates and such. See also column 58, lines 12-

14, which discusses the central computer scheduling with the provider based on geographic

region, meaning that the system knows the company with which the order was placed).

6.   As per claim 5, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein determining whether the service

order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

        determining whether the service order includes an assignment of facilities (See column

53, lines 29-48, column 56, lines 3-23, column 57, lines 8-37, in which a more in depth

processing analyzes the service to ascertain the necessary facilities and the need for assignment

of these facilities).

7.   As per claim 6, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein determining whether the service

indicates that a dispatch is unnecessary comprises:

        determining whether the assignment of facilities uses the same facilities that were

previously assigned to a location associated with the service order (See column 57, lines 11-17,

wherein during the more in depth processing the current status of the facilities are accessed to see

what exact work needs to be done).

8.   As per claim 7, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein canceling the dispatch

comprises:

        correcting the service order so that the dispatch associated with the service order is

canceled (See Figure 12 and column 57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and 51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10,

36-49, which disclose fixing the original records stored about the service appointment date to reflect the dispatch being unnecessary and canceled. When the assessment shows 0 hours of work needed on the appointment date (i.e. the dispatch is unnecessary) then the system's records are updated to reflect the cancellation of the appointment. The appointment time is now free for other service order dispatches).

9.   As per claim 10, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary comprises:

periodically generating a report based upon selected ones of the predefined criteria that includes all service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria (See at least column 56, lines 41-61, wherein a statement is generated and issued at times (when required for a preliminary quote), using the databases, using the predefined criteria and all the service orders related to these criteria).

10.   As per claim 11, Storch et al. discuses a system for eliminating unnecessary dispatches, comprising:

a service order control system for receiving service requests from a source and for generating a service order (See at least figure 12, column 53, lines 15-31 and 53-65, column 54, lines 1-4, 14-17, 28-31, and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-17, and column 56, lines 1-19 and 25-37, wherein the predefined criteria are obtained from a customer and used to generate the initial service order. The service order includes any necessary facilities assignments);

a work management center for receiving the service order from the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch (See at least figure 12, and column 56, lines 41-64, wherein the service order is received from the service order control

system and an initial determination is made as to whether the service order requires a dispatch);

and

a trap service order system for monitoring the service order generated by the service

order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch, and if so,

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicate the service

order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch, and if so, further examining the service order to

determine whether the dispatch is unnecessary (See at least figure 12, column 57, lines 8-31 and

34-40, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, and 53-56, wherein the initial determinations are

monitored and a determination is made as to whether or not the service order requires a dispatch

based on more specific information about the service order type and information in fields of the

service order. This information is compared to other service orders' predefined criteria).

11.   As per claim 13, Storch et al. teaches a system further comprising a loop facility

assignment control system for receiving the service order and for assigning facilities for the

service order, wherein if the trap service order system determines that the dispatch is

unnecessary, then the trap service order system communicates with the loop facility assignment

control system to update a database in the loop facility assignment control system (See column

55, lines 2-6, 25-38, and 41-45, and column 56, lines 32-34 and 41-48, which discuss the set up

of a preliminary appointment which includes an initial assignment of facilities to service the

order. See column 57, lines 8-37, which discusses the trapping of service orders not requiring

the dispatch of a technician, though previously assigned. When changes are made to the initial

assignment, the stored records associated with the service order are updated).

12.   As per claim 14, Storch et al. discloses a system wherein if the trap service order system

determines that the dispatch should be canceled, then the trap service order system

communicates with the service order control system to update a database in the service order

control system (See figure 12, column 55, lines 17-23 and 38-46, column 57, lines 32-46 and 51-

53, column 58, lines 22-31 and 36-41, which describes sending a notification to the service order

control system about the change in the appointment status of a service order, therefore updating

the database of appointment availability).

13.   As per claim 15, Storch et al. teaches a system wherein the service order control system

generates a corrected service order, which cancels the dispatch in response to the database update

(See Figure 12 and column 57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and 51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49,

which disclose fixing the original records stored about the service appointment date to reflect the

dispatch being unnecessary and canceled. When the assessment shows 0 hours of work needed

on the appointment date (i.e. the dispatch is unnecessary) then the system's records are updated

to reflect the cancellation of the appointment. The appointment time is now free for other

service order dispatches).

14.   As per claim 16, Storch et al. discloses a system wherein the trap service order system is

operative to identify all service orders that require a dispatch and that meet a set of predefined

criteria (See at least figure 12, column 57, lines 8-31 and 34-40, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-

49, and 53-56, wherein the trap service order system works to recognize which service orders

require dispatch based on predefined criteria).

15.   As per claim 17, Storch et al. discusses a method for eliminating an unnecessary dispatch

of a service technician, comprising:

generating a service order indicating that a dispatch of a service technician is required

(See column 53, lines 60-67, column 54, lines 1-15 and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-10 and 18-30,

wherein a service order is generated in the system and a date is set up in the system based on the

availability of technicians);

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicate the

likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch by examining selected sections of the service order (See at

least figure 12, column 53, lines 29-46, column 54, lines 1-4 and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-5,

column 56, lines 1-19, 25-37, and 41-56, column 57, lines 8-31, wherein the predefined criteria

are obtained and used to generate the initial service order. After an appointment is set on the

initial service order, the predefined criteria from sections of the service order are looked at to

determine if the service order does not require a dispatch);

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the

dispatch is unnecessary (See at least figure 12, and column 57, lines 8-31, wherein when the

service order meets certain criteria, based on previously obtained data the dispatch is determined

to be not needed); and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then eliminating the dispatch by correcting the service

order and canceling a dispatch order for the dispatch (See at least figure 12, column 57, lines 8-

31 and 34-40, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, and 53-56, wherein the dispatch is not needed

and the dispatch associated with the service order is eliminated. See also Figure 12 and column

57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and 51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, which disclose fixing the

original records stored about the service appointment date to reflect the dispatch being

unnecessary and canceled. When the assessment shows 0 hours of work needed on the

appointment date (i.e. the dispatch is unnecessary) then the system's records are updated to reflect the cancellation of the appointment. The appointment time is now free for other service order dispatches).

16.   As per claim 18, Storch et al. discusses a method wherein the set of predefined criteria is selected based upon an analysis of past dispatches (See column 56, lines 45-61, and column 57, lines 8-21, which discusses using tables storing records concerning past dispatches and statistical analysis to determine the need for dispatch. The records are applied based on the information provided in the current service order).

17.   As per claim 19, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein the set of predefined criteria includes determining whether the service order is a new install or a reinstall/reconnect (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15, and column 57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if the service is a new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

18.   As per claim 20, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein correcting the service order comprises updating a database associated with a service order control system (See figure 12, column 55, lines 17-23 and 38-46, column 57, lines 32-46 and 51-53, column 58, lines 22-31 and 36-41, which describes sending a notification to the service order control system about the updated service order and it's appointment needs, therefore updating a database of appointment availability).

19.   As per claim 21, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein the service order is for a new install (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15, and column

57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if the service is a

new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

20..   As per claim 22, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein the service order is for a

reinstall/reconnect (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15,

and column 57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if

the service is a new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

21.   As per claim 23, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein canceling the dispatch

comprises:

    generating a corrected service order (See Figure 12 and column 57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and

51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, which disclose fixing the original records stored about

the service appointment date to reflect the dispatch being unnecessary and canceled. When the

assessment shows 0 hours of work needed on the appointment date (i.e. the dispatch is

unnecessary) then the system's records are updated to reflect the cancellation of the appointment.

The appointment time is now free for other service order dispatches);

    determining whether the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order (See

figure 12, column 57, lines 38-42, and column 58, lines 5-35, wherein the corrected service order

is looked at to see if the dispatch order exists in correlation to it);

    if the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order, then canceling the

dispatch order (See at least figure 12, column 57, lines 38-42, and column 58, lines 5-35,

wherein if in the preliminary phase a dispatch order was associated to the order and it is no

longer needed, the dispatch order is canceled and the appointment date/time becomes available).

22.   As per claim 24, Storch et al. teaches a system wherein the service order is for a new

install (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15, and column

57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if the service is a

new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

23.   As per claim 25, Storch et al. teaches a system wherein the service order is for a

reinstall/reconnect (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15,

and column 57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if

the service is a new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

24.   As per claim 26, Storch et al. discloses a system wherein if the service order requires a

dispatch, then the work management center generates a dispatch order (See at least figure 12, and

column 56, lines 41-64, wherein the service order is received from the service order control

system and an initial determination is made as to whether the service order requires a dispatch.

If a dispatch is required, an dispatch order is arranged in the system).

25.   As per claim 27, Storch et al. teaches a system wherein the service order control system

generates a corrected service order, and wherein the work management center determines

whether the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order and if the corrected service

order corresponds to the dispatch order, then the work management center cancels the dispatch

order (See Figure 12 and column 57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and 51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10,

36-49, which disclose fixing the original records stored about the service appointment date to

reflect the dispatch being unnecessary and canceled. When the assessment shows 0 hours of

work needed on the appointment date (i.e. the dispatch is unnecessary) then the system's records

are updated to reflect the cancellation of the appointment. See column 57, lines 38-42, and

column 58, lines 5-35, wherein the dispatch order that corresponds to the corrected order is found and, if no longer needed, the dispatch order is canceled and the appointment date/time becomes available).

26.   As per claim 28, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein the service order is for a new install (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15, and column 57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if the service is a new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

27.   As per claim 29, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein the service order is for a reinstall/reconnect (See column 52, lines 16-21, column 43, lines 29-46, column 56, lines 10-15, and column 57, lines 11-17, which uses the specific areas of the stored records to determine if the service is a new install or a reinstall/reconnect).

28.   As per claim 30, Storch et al. teaches a method for eliminating an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician, comprising:

    generating a service order indicating that a dispatch of a service technician is required (See column 53, lines 60-67, column 54, lines 1-15 and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-10 and 18-30, wherein a service order is generated in the system and a date is set up in the system based on the availability of technicians);

    determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicate a likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch by examining selected sections of the service order (See at least figure 12, column 53, lines 29-46, column 54, lines 1-4 and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-5, column 56, lines 1-19, 25-37, and 41-56, column 57, lines 8-31, wherein the predefined criteria are obtained and used to generate the initial service order. After an appointment is set on the

initial service order, the predefined criteria from sections of the service order are looked at to

determine if the service order does not require a dispatch);

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the

dispatch is unnecessary (See at least figure 12, and column 57, lines 8-31, wherein when the

service order meets certain criteria, based on previously obtained data the dispatch is determined

to be not needed); and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then eliminating the dispatch by:

generating a corrected service order (See Figure 12 and column 57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and

51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, which disclose fixing the original records stored about

the service appointment date to reflect the dispatch being unnecessary and canceled. When the

assessment shows 0 hours of work needed on the appointment date (i.e. the dispatch is

unnecessary) then the system's records are updated to reflect the cancellation of the appointment.

The appointment time is now free for other service order dispatches);

determining whether the corrected service order corresponds to a dispatch order

generated in response to the service order (See figure 12, column 57, lines 38-42, and column 58,

lines 5-35, wherein the corrected service order is looked at to see if the dispatch order exists in

correlation to it); and

if the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order, then canceling the

dispatch order (See at least figure 12, column 57, lines 38-42, and column 58, lines 5-35,

wherein if in the preliminary phase a dispatch order was associated to the order and it is no

longer needed, the dispatch order is canceled and the appointment date/time becomes available).

29.   As per claim 31, Storch et al.discloses a system for eliminating unnecessary dispatches,

comprising:

a service order control system for receiving service requests from a source, generating a

service order, and generating a corrected service order in response to a communication from a

trap service order system (See at least figure 12, column 53, lines 15-31 and 53-65, column 54,

lines 1-4, 14-17, 28-31, and 65-67, column 55, lines 1-17, and column 56, lines 1-19 and 25-37,

wherein the predefined criteria are obtained from a customer and used to generate the initial

service order. The service order includes any necessary facilities assignments. See figure 12,

column 57, lines 8-31, 34-40, and 51-54, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, wherein the service

order control system also corrects the service order after the trap service order system analyzes

it);

a work management center for receiving the service order from the service order control

system, determining whether the service order requires a dispatch, and if so then generating a

dispatch order, receiving the corrected service order from the service order control system, for

determining whether the corrected service order corresponds to the dispatch order, and if so,

canceling the dispatch order (See at least figure 12, and column 56, lines 41-64, wherein the

service order is received from the service order control system and an initial determination is

made as to whether the service order requires a dispatch. See at least figure 12, column 57, lines

38-42, and column 58, lines 5-35, wherein, when the service order is corrected, the system

locates a dispatch order associated with the original order, if one exists, and cancels it, if

necessary); and

the trap service order system for monitoring the service order generated but the service

order control system, determining whether the service order requires a dispatch, and if so, then

comparing a service order type and information in the selected field of the service order with a

set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary

dispatch, and if so, then further examining the service order to determine whether the dispatch is

unnecessary, and if so, then communicating with the service order control system (See at least

figure 12, column 57, lines 8-31 and 34-40, and column 58, lines 5-10, 36-49, and 53-56,

wherein the initial determinations are monitored and a determination is made as to whether or

not the service order requires a dispatch based on more specific information about the service

order type and information in fields of the service order. This information is compared to other

service orders' predefined criteria. This is communicated to the system controlling the service

order).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

30.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Storch et al. (U.S. 5,920,846).

31.   As per claim 3, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein determining whether the service

order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

determining the requirement of dispatch for the service order is determined by a work

management center (See at least figure 12, and column 57, lines 8-31, wherein when the service

order meets certain criteria, based on previously obtained data the dispatch is determined to be

needed or not).

Storch et al. further discloses an override code that requires dispatch of a technician in an

emergency situation (See also column 59, lines 2-21, which discuss the ability of the order taker

to place an override code on a service order, said override code ignoring the closed or

unavailable appointment times).

However, Storch et al. does not expressly disclose the override code being used to require

a dispatch regardless of a dispatch determination by a work management center.

FID or Field Identifier codes are assigned to service orders to indicate how to process the

service order, as stated in column 59, lines 45-56. Storch et al. discloses the ability to assign an

FID in an emergency situation that overrides closed appointments in the system, regardless of the

system determination of availability. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the override code of Storch et al. to require a

dispatch regardless of a dispatch determination by a work management center in order to

increase the flexibility of the tool by allowing an order taker to effectively meet the needs of the

customer placing the service order.

32.   As per claim 4, Storch et al. teaches a method wherein determining whether the service

order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

determining whether the service order is related to a second service order (See column 56, lines 41-62, and column 57, lines 10-33, wherein the service order is analyzed for its association to other service orders that have already had determinations made).

However, Storch et al. does not expressly disclose that the second service order is pending.

Storch et al. teaches that when the tool is making a determination as to the necessity of the dispatch, it searches the service order's predefined criteria against a set of predefined criteria stored in database about other service orders. This data includes information about the predefined criteria of other service orders and the number of times a dispatch was required in those service orders. Whether the other service orders are pending completion or already completed is irrelevant to the determination of a dispatch in those instances. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine whether a service order is related to a second pending service order in order to more accurately identify if the current service order will cause an unnecessary dispatch by looking at past determinations related to the other service orders.

33.   As per claim 8, Storch et al. teaches a method further comprising the steps of:

placing the dispatch on hold while making a determination about the need for the dispatch (See at least figure 12, and column 57, lines 8-31, wherein the dispatch is waiting to occur until a determination has been made);

determining whether the dispatch should be scheduled to occur within a predetermined time period (See at least figure 12, and column 57, lines 8-31, which discusses deciding if the dispatch is scheduled occur within a predetermined time period); and

if the dispatch is scheduled to occur within the predetermined time period, then causing

the dispatch to occur if no follow-up assessment takes place (See column 57, lines 55-60,

wherein if the follow-up assessment does not occur within a predetermined amount of time, the

system uses the initial assessment of the situation and sends the dispatch).

However, Storch et al. does not expressly disclose placing the dispatch on hold prior to

determining whether the dispatch is necessary if the dispatch is scheduled to occur with a

predetermined time period.

Storch et al. discloses that after a dispatch is preliminarily scheduled, the dispatch waits

to occur until a determination is made about the necessity of the dispatch. At this point, it is

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that if the determination by the system does not occur

by a certain time, the tool has two choices – to proceed or to wait (i.e. the dispatch must proceed

or be cancelled/wait and be pushed back). As per the system of Storch et al., if the determination

is not made within a predetermined amount of time, the system proceeds with its initial

assessment. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

place the dispatch on hold before an assessment is made in order to increase the accuracy of the

dispatches by reviewing each preliminary dispatch before allowing it to occur.

34.   As per claim 9, Storch et al. discloses a method wherein determining whether the

dispatch is unnecessary comprises:

in response to receiving a query based upon ones of the predefined criteria, searching a

database of service orders that indicate a dispatch is required to locate service orders that meet

the selected predefined criteria (See column 56, lines 41-62, and column 57, lines 10-33, wherein

the system is queried based upon the predetermined criteria and a database of service orders is searched to locate situations where a dispatch was required); and

providing the service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria (See column 56, lines 41-62, and column 57, lines 10-33, wherein the service orders are made available that meet the certain predefined criteria).

However, Storch et al. does not expressly disclose that the second service order is pending.

Storch et al. teaches that when the tool is making a determination as to the necessity of the dispatch, it searches the service order's predefined criteria against a set of predefined criteria stored in database about other service orders. This data includes information about the predefined criteria of other service orders and the number of times a dispatch was required in those service orders. Whether the other service orders are pending completion or already completed is irrelevant to the determination of a dispatch in those instances. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to search a database of pending service orders in order to more accurately identify if the current service order will cause an unnecessary dispatch by looking at past determinations related to the other service orders.

35.   As per claim 12, Storch et al. teaches a system wherein if the trap service order system determines that the dispatch is unnecessary and that the dispatch is scheduled to occur at a predetermined period of time, then the trap service order system communicates with the work management center to cancel the dispatch and auto-complete the service order (See figure 12, column 56, lines 28-34 and 62-65, and column 57, lines 8-37 and 51-54, and column 58, lines 5-

10, 36-49, and 53-56, which discuss that if the determination of a dispatch renders it unnecessary

and that the dispatch is scheduled to occur at a predetermined time period, then the system

communicates with the work management center associated with the service order to cancel the

dispatch and aut-complete the service).

However, Storch et al. does not expressly disclose that the trap service order system

communicates with the work management center to place the dispatch on hold.

Storch et al. teaches scheduling an appointment for dispatch at a work management

center and then determining if the dispatch is unnecessary. When the dispatch is unnecessary,

the service order is taken care of using auto-complete, which does not require the dispatch of the

technician. At this point, the previously scheduled dispatch is unnecessary. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place the dispatch on

hold instead of canceling the dispatch in order to increase customer satisfaction with the

company utilizing the tool by ensuring that the service order is completed as promised. If the

auto-complete does not accomplish the service order, than the dispatch that was placed on hold

may be utilized.

Response to Arguments

36.   Applicant's arguments with regard to the rejections based on Storch et al. (U.S.

5,920,846) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, the Applicant

argues that Storch et al. does not teach or suggest (1) the limitations of claim 1 or claim 17

because, in contrast, Storch et al. discloses sending a service order to a WFA/DO system that

determines whether an outside technician needs to be dispatched by assigning a service order an

exact final time estimate for work based on information (class of service, Field Identifiers, etc.),

and then, based on this final time estimate, indicating whether dispatch of an outside technician

is needed to complete the service request, (2) the limitations of claim 31, because, in contrast,

Storch et al. discloses processing a service request using a WFA/DO system that determines

whether an outside technician needs to be dispatched by assigning a service order an exact final

time estimate for work based on information (class of service, Field Identifiers, etc.), and a

computer system then receives the final time estimate from the WFA/DO system and updates its

records indicating the total time available in a geographic area for the date and time as indicated

on the service order.

In response to argument (1) of the Applicant, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Storch et

al. teaches that assigning a technician dispatch occurs in 2 Tiers. An order taker person or the

user interacts with order entry system (SORD) to record information concerning the requested

service as well as determine an appointment due date for installation of the service based on the

availability of an outside technician. See column 55, lines 20-32. During this interaction, the

order taker person/user is presented with list of available dates and times using SORD and the

Due Date Availability system (DUDAS). DUDAS lets the SORD system know if requested

dates and times are open by interacting with the WFA/DO computer system to maintain

availability information of the technicians per geographic area. In Tier 1, information relating to

the service order is initially transmitted throughout the integrated system to let the systems know

of the existence of the service order. During this initial transmission, the WFA/DO assigns a

preliminary price, an estimated time for a technician to complete the service, and a "pending

facility assignment" (PFA) status code to the service order. All of these items assigned the

service order are based on a technician being preliminarily assigned to the service order for

dispatch. Next, in Tier 2, the WFA/DO reexamines the service order to see what work exactly

needs to be done by the technician to achieve the requested service. Therefore, in this step, since

more information is known, exact time estimates can be determined and the status code is

changed to "pending load" (PLD) or "Pending auto-completion" (PAC). Based on these codes,

the technician is firmly assigned times, these corrected times associated with the service order

and updated in the records of the system, or the technician is canceled, and the cancellation is

associated with the service order and updated in the records of the system. See column 58, lines

5-30 and 36-56. SORD is notified of appointment availability. If Tier 2 does not occur, the Tier

1 technician assignment information is used. See column 57, lines 55-59. Therefore, Storch et

al. does teach the limitations of claims 1 and 17, because it does generate a service order that

indicates the dispatch of a technician with SORD and Tier 1 and Tier 2 determines is the specific

criteria of the service order indicates that the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary

dispatch, determines if the dispatch is unnecessary, and cancels the dispatch associated with the

service order if it is unnecessary and updates the DUDAS system.

In response to argument (2) of the Applicant, Examiner again respectfully disagrees.

Using the same explanation of the prior art above, Storch et al. does teach claim 31 because it

discloses an integrated system that includes the SORD, DUDAS, and WFA/DO systems that

perform the capabilities discussed in claim 31. See the art rejection set forth above.

Conclusion

37. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

38.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Kocur (U.S. 5,913,201) discloses assigning work projects to workers using a system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

bvd
October 1, 2003

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600